

N62604.AR.000524  
NCBC GULFPORT  
5090.3a

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES 13 NOVEMBER 2001 NCBC  
GULFPORT MS  
11/13/2001  
NCBC GULFPORT

39501 - GENERAL  
13.03.00.0049



Gulfport, Mississippi

**NCBC Gulfport RAB Meeting  
Naval Construction Battalion Center  
Gulfport, Mississippi  
November 13, 2001**

The following members of the Restoration Advisory Board met in the Harrison County Gulfport Public Library on November 13, 2001:

CDR Mark Ashley  
Gordon Crane  
Skip McDaniel, Community Co-Chair  
David Marshall  
Joyce Shaw  
Philip Shaw  
Earl Whittemore

Support personnel attending the meeting included:

Jason Brown, Tetra Tech NUS  
Art Conrad, Southern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Bob Fisher, Tetra Tech NUS  
Nancy Rouse, Tetra Tech NUS subcontractor

Mike Hawkins of AFCEE attended as a representative of the Air Force and Cherie Schulz attended as an interested community member.

**Welcome:**

Skip McDaniel opened the meeting at 6:30 P.M.

**Agreed Order and Installation Restoration Program (AO/IR) Update:** Art Conrad presented the following information as part of the AO/IR Update.

Off-Site Brownfields Program

The Brownfields Program is being designed for implementation on off-base properties where dioxin was found. We are still working on the details of how the Navy provides the funding for MDEQ to review the documents produced.

Biological Monitoring Report

The final report has been also reviewed by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Their comments will be incorporated in 2002.

Remediation of Site 8

The *Treatability Study* is complete and the draft report was submitted to the Navy on November 8 for review. The *Focused Feasibility Study (FFS)* has been conducted to determine the best way to manage soils containing dioxin. The report has been reviewed and approved by MDEQ. The results of the *Focused Feasibility Study* will be presented to the

community within a document called a *Proposed Plan* that will summarize the findings of the FFS and propose a best solution from those findings.

#### Site 10

A Workplan has been approved by MDEQ for expanded studies of the soil and groundwater at the site. Fieldwork for the study is scheduled to begin in January 2002.

#### Site 6

An Enhanced Bio-slurper has been installed at Site 6 to improve the removal of fuel in the groundwater. The system was started up on the week of November 5, 2001.

#### Site 5

A Remedial Investigation (RI) is underway at this site. A Feasibility Study (FS) is planned in 2002.

#### Site 4

A Remedial Investigation will be conducted at Site 4 in 2002.

### **Engineering Studies**

Jason Brown of TetraTech presented the results of the Pilot Scale engineering studies recently nearing completion. These tests are being conducted in support of the dioxin cleanup. He described how the community was protected during the testing with the use of sediment recovery traps and the on-site work practices that included dividing the work area into a "Study Area and a "Clean Area."

Excavation Test: Four separate tests were completed. The first was an Excavation Test, completed to determine the best way to remove contaminated soil from areas on and off of the base. Engineers determined that muddy conditions made it nearly impossible to excavate sediment in the swampy areas north of the base. As a result, engineers recommended that large-scale excavation of contaminated soil should be scheduled for the dry season. Excavation during this testing will involve the complete removal of contaminated soil from the Edwards property (a swampy area north of the base) during the next few weeks.

Free Water Removal Test: The second test was a Free Water Removal Test that was conducted to determine how much water would be lost from the muddy sediment after excavation. Prior to testing, engineers thought that it might be necessary to remove water from the muddy sediments excavated from the various contaminated areas so that a suitable mixture of soil and cement could be achieved. However, it was determined that removing water may not be necessary to create the soil/cement mixture needed at Site 8.

Mixing and Spreading Test: This test confirmed the best way to evenly mix dioxin-containing soil with the right amount of cement. A mix of between 5 -10% cement and soils was found to be the best both with respect to ultimate strength and ease of mixing and spreading.

Compaction Strength Test: This test evaluated the strength of the soil/cement mixture after it was mixed and spread into "lifts" at the site. Engineers found that the compacted blend would be stronger than that required of an interstate highway.

Leachability Test: A Leachability Test was performed to ensure that dioxin would be held in place by the cap. Samples were collected at the base of the compacted soil and cement mixture and sent to a laboratory. The laboratory techniques were selected to simulate natural conditions. The test showed that dioxin was not washed out of the mixture.

### **Feasibility Study**

Bob Fisher of TetraTech NUS presented the results of the Feasibility Study (FS). He discussed the overall cleanup process and illustrated where the feasibility study fits into the process. He described the FS process by explaining that first a variety of cleanup technologies are evaluated, then these separate technologies are group into whole cleanup processes called cleanup “alternatives.” These alternatives are then carefully evaluated against criteria established by the US Environmental Protection Agency. This analysis is ultimately used is the selection of a recommended cleanup solution.

Four alternatives were evaluated for dioxin cleanup.

The first alternative is described as “No Action.” While this alternative does not directly address contamination issues, the cleanup process dictates that it be considered to serve as a baseline for the comparison of other more feasible alternatives.

Alternative 2 was described as “Institutional Controls and Monitoring.” In this alternative, the Former Herbicide Orange Storage Area (Site 8) would be fenced in and posted, land use controls would restrict future use of the site, and annual sampling of be performed determine if dioxin continues to move from the site. This alternative would not address contain the dioxin contamination, and would essentially look like the current management of Site 8.

Alternative 3 is a much more complex alternative that included: excavation (removal of contaminated soil, sediment and ash from it’s current location); surface water controls (continued control of the movement of sediment in ditches using sediment recovery traps); dewatering (removal of excess water in the sediment as needed); chemical stabilization and on-base landfilling (mixing of contaminated soil with cement and compacting it on Site 8; Capping (covering the compacted mixture with a layer of soil or other material to further protect the cap; Institutional Controls to limit the future use of the site to industrial activities; and Monitoring to ensure that dioxin has not leached out of the landfill. Alternative 3 would successfully move contamination to Site 8 and cover it with a cap that would be able to withstand as much weight as an interstate highway.

Alternative 4 would include excavation, surface water controls, and dewatering as described in Alternative 3. These steps would be followed by transporting the truckloads of contaminated soil to a distant hazardous waste incinerator. This alternative is extremely expensive and is undesirable because of the problems associated with transporting large amounts (???) of hazardous waste over long distances. However, it is the only remedy that would actually result in the complete destruction of the hazardous waste.

The next step in the process is the completion of a proposed plan that will recommend the preferred cleanup remedy. This plan is expected to be available for public comment in January 2002.

## **Conclusion**

The next meeting will be held in conjunction with the public meetings associated with the release of the final proposed plan. These meetings will most likely be held in mid-January, 2002.

The RAB members suggested that there is a need to revisit the RAB roster to see who is still interested in participating. Nancy Rouse will summarize the attendance records and review the charter to determine if it is time to recruit additional members to the team.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45.